DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 228 115 SO 014 505

AUTHOR Binford, Michael B.
TITLE Semi-Projective Methods, Political Attitudes, and Political Reasoning.
PUB DATE Sep 82
NOTE 38p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association (Denver, CO, September 2-5, 1982). Not available in paper copy due to marginal legibility of original document.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Data Analysis; *Holistic Approach; *Political Attitudes; Political Science; *Projective Measures; *Public Opinion; *Research Methodology; Research Problems; Social Science Research

ABSTRACT

Semi-projective holistic methods in political science research can augment knowledge of political attitudes and political reasoning. Semi-projective methods refer to techniques which present focused or structured stimuli and allow an unrestricted range of responses. Visual stimuli include ink blots, standard drawings, political cartoons, or draw-a-person tests. Verbal stimuli include word associations, incomplete sentences, and unfinished stories or political dilemmas. For example, the interviewer asks for responses to words and sentences such as "Democrat," "president," "union," or "I am most proud of my government's" (respondent completes the sentence). Unfinished stories focus on neighbor's feelings, running a meeting, jury problem, protest permit, zoning board, robbery, pollution, economy and the role of government, and the morality of stealing to save a life. Because the respondent is drawn into the research process, semi-projective methods provide rich, elaborate verbal data which examine the links between attitudes and basic beliefs. Given a restricted sample size, participants are selected as representatives of theoretically significant types. Major drawbacks are the quantity of data, complex coding procedures, and the need to edit responses. Profiles of two participants, interview formats, and a transcript are included. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED228115

SEMI-PROJECTIVE METHODS, POLITICAL ATTITUDES, AND POLITICAL REASONING

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Michael B. Binford
Thomas E. Mann
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Michael B. Binford

Georgia State University

SP 014 505

Prepared for delivery at the 1982 Annual Meeting of The American Political Science Association, The Denver Hilton Hotel, September 2-5, 1982. Copyright by the American Political Science Association.

This paper is a brief introduction to semi-projective methods and their use in studying political attitudes and styles of reasoning. A description and definition of semi-projective methods are given, and recent works which have used them are noted. The major varieties of semi-projective techniques are described and compared, and the advantages and disadvantages of the techniques are discussed. Particular attention is paid to the underlying holistic theories of personality and methodology upon which semi-projective methods have developed. An heuristic example of semi-projective data analysis is included, as well as several examples of various semi-projective techniques.

To describe a semi-projective method properly, one must first describe projective methods, as they have been developed in clinical psychology. Edwin Schneidman, in an excellent introduction to these methods, describes fully projective methods as

> psychological measurement devices which are characterized (1) on the stimulus side by ambiguity in the stimulus, (2) on the response side by the multiplicity of responses permitted the subject in an open situation where the responses do not have a right or wrong character, and (3) in the interpretation aspect by the interest of the interpreter in the unconscious or latent aspects of personality and in their amenability to holistic personality analysis (Schneidman, 1965, p. 500).

The utility of fully projective methods, such as the Rorschach "ink blot" test, as diagnostic tools in clinical psychology and psychotherapy has been long recognized (See Rabin, 1968; Hurstein, 1965). The creation of the Journal of Personality Assessment and Projective Techniques, now known as the Journal of Personality Assessment, testifies to the widespread use of projective methods. A recent review of the use of the Rorschach by Richard Howes (Howes, 1981) indicates that the method has its critics, but it remains a major analytic tool. By and large, however, political scientists are not as concerned with analyzing unconscious aspects of personality as clinical psychologists are, and fully projective methods have been viewed with some suspicion in the discipline. (One exception is the work of Gutman, Rothman and Lichter, 1979.)

While political scientists studying political attitudes are more likely to use survey research as their primary method, semi-projective methods have been used upon occasion. (See Knutson,

1973, for the most thorough treatment of projective techniques' potential utility in political science research). In the most detailed description of the development and application of a semi-projective technique in political science, Greenstein and Tarrow note:

> Semi-projective procedures typically employ less exotic and somewhat less ambiguous stimuli than orthodox projective procedures and are used to elicit surface psychocultural dispositions (cognitive and value assumptions, perceptual sets, assumptions about behavioral norms and the like) rather than deep strata of the personality (Greenstein and Tarrow, 1970, p. 480).

They feel that such techniques provide "naturalistic data." That is, the respondents

> exhibit feelings, explicit and implicit cognitions of reality, and assumptions about how feelings and cognitive perceptions are likely to manifest themselves behaviorally-and they do this in the course of reasoning about situational stimuli (Greenstein and Tarrow, 1970, p. 530).

The respondents show their political attitudes and their dynamics of reasoning much as they do in real life, not artifactually separated into the analytic categories of cognitions, affects and conations so prevalent in the study of attitudes. Use of such methods may diminish the reductionist tendencies often found in empirical analysis of political attitudes.

Greenstein and Tarrow believe that semi-projective methods provide for relatively unrestrained responses and "fantasy elaboration," but the "stimulus content is more structured and culturally patterned" (Greenstein and Tarrow, 1970, p. 501). The data are interpreted at a "surface" level, rather than at a deep or psychodiagnostic level.

For our purposes, semi-projective methods will be defined as any technique which presents a respondent with a focused or structured stimuli and allows (or indeed, encourages) an unrestricted range of responses based upon the respondent's total political belief system. In effect, the data generated are rich and relatively idiosyncratic, often resembling the data from depth or unstructured interviews; the difference is that the data are produced by common or comparable stimuli. A number of techniques used in political science research, such as the Thematic

Apperception Test (TAT) and a variety of unfinished hypothetical stories, such as Kohlberg's Moral Dilemmas, fit this definition.

Both Greenstein and Tarrow (1970) and Knutson (1973a) provide detailed reports of early studies which have used projective or semi-projective techniques to study politically relevant topics, and interested readers are referred to these works for a summary of the early uses. More recent works using these techniques include Knutson's work with visual stimuli and children (Knutson 1974a, 1974b) and a rapidly growing body of work using some form of Kohlberg's Moral Dilemmas test (Fishkin, Keniston, and MacKinnon, 1973; Fontana and Noel, 1973; O'Connor, 1974; Merelman, 1977). Other studies have used personally developed unfinished stories (Merelman and McCabe, 1974; Sarat, 1975; Patterson, 1979; Sylvia, Mustafa and Hamilton, 1981) or projective situations or interviews (Merelman, 1971, 1973; Rasseches, 1978).

As is clear from this brief description of studies which have employed semi-projective methods, these techniques have been used, although intermittently, in the study of political attitudes and political reasoning. However, survey research clearly has established hegemony in the area of political attitude research.

The two major groups of semi-projective methods have either visual or verbal stimuli. The visual stimuli include ink blots, standard drawings or pictures, political cartoons or draw-a-person tests. With these visual stimuli, the respondents are asked to describe what they see or to make up a story about what is happening in the picture. Responses are recorded and analyzed, using a variety of coding schemes. The coding may be qualitative or quantitative, according to procedures usually employed in content analysis.

Verbal stimuli have included words, phrases, incomplete sentences and unfinished stories or situational dilemmas. Respondents offer their first reactions to the words, complete the sentences or finish the stories. Again, the responses are recorded and coded. Both thematic or qualitative coding, and quantitative coding schemes have been used with these methods.

In examining the utility of these different types of semi-projective methods, I have been using a combination of these techniques, including the Political Thematic Apperception Measure (PTAM), developed by Jeanne Knutson, political word associations, sentence completions and a series of nine hypothetical, unfinished political dilemmas (See Appendix A; Binford, 1981). Additionally, one of Kohlberg's Moral Dilemmas stories and traditional scales measuring locus of control, tolerance of ambiguity, self-esteem, anomie, authoritarianism, liberalism/conservatism and democratic attitudes are administered. Interviews have been completed with eleven retired citizens, ten undergraduates and approximately half of a theoretically selected sample of

political campaign volunteers. A survey research project on political campaign workers in the Atlanta area was conducted in the early months of 1981 (N=125); these volunteers provided the population for the semi-projective sample. Respondents have been partitioned by education (high school or less, college, post-college) and ideology (liberal, moderate, conservative). Two respondents from each possible combination of education and ideology are being interviewed with the battery of semi-projective methods. The theoretical sample will allow a rudimentary examination of the influence of education and ideology among a politically active group. A later project will involve a comparison of the survey data with the semi-projective data for these eighteen people. All the quotations used in this paper come from this group of approximately thirty interviews.

Word Associations. The word association method asks people to respond with whatever comes to mind first. Terms or concepts offering a wide range of topics were selected to provide a broad range of stimuli. Concrete terms (bureaucrats) and abstract terms (democracy, politics) were included, as well as terms from various levels and types of political activities. Usually, responses are very brief, although occasionally a more complete thought will be generated. Sometimes respondents draw a blank and are not able to respond. In general, three patterns emerged: (1) predominantly evaluative responses (Democrats: "Great"; Radicals: "Terrible"), (2) predominantly cognitive responses (President: "He is the Chief Executive." Congress: "They make the laws.") or (3) mixed cognitive/evaluative responses (Unions: "That's groups of people that have formed together to better conditions." Conservative: "A person that wants rights for himself but not for others."). These patterns tend to be consistent for all of the words presented, and the respondents with the mixed patterns seem to have much more articulate belief systems. This articulate designation holds for the other semi-projective methods as well.

Another regular pattern is that the cognitive pattern appears more consistently among the undergraduates. One plausible explanation would be their age; for many young people, political concepts may be mainly cognitive, with very little affective charge. Of course, a more obvious explanation is the test-like demand characteristics of this particular interview situation: being asked to respond to political terms by a college professor who teaches political science may well trigger textbook responses.

The word associations usually move very quickly and seem to elicit quick, unmeditated responses. While the responses may appear superficial, I believe they represent an unguarded, unthought-out reaction and usually provide data that can be supported from the other methods. The word associations are a good introduction to the sentence completions, which encourage fuller responses.

Sentence completions. Unfinished sentences were created that combined a specific referent and either an evaluative component or a time perspective component (I am most proud of our government's _____. The Democrats always _____.) Again, an effort was made to include partisan and nonpartisan terms and a variety of political activities and groups. Responses to these incomplete sentences were usually articulate and indicated a combined affective, cognitive and conative nature. Quite often, especially with the politically articulate or experienced, the incomplete sentence would stimulate a whole paragraph. In general, there were fewer absences of response, and the most common stumbling block was the inclusion of modifiers such as "always." Occasionally people would hesitate at making such broad generalizations, particularly about groups they knew well. Political attitudes about the limits of appropriate political activity for the respondent were easily discernible, as were attitudes about the way the political process has dealt with several groups of people.

Several sentences call for respondents to separate current political reality from their normative aspirations regarding the perfect political system. When respondents sensed such a disparity, the sentence completion form allowed them to articulate and qualify their responses. (Most minority groups in America have--"come a long way. They still have a long way to go.") This is/ought disparity came up in response to some of the scale items regarding democratic attitudes, but in the closed-ended, Likert-type response categories such subtle differentiations are not possible. Interestingly, for several people, the scale items served as semi-projective stimuli, causing a digression for a more complete explanation. Often, the respondent would qualify the response with a comment such as "well, it ought to be this way, but currently it is not". Incorporating such qualifications or digressions into the data analysis is not possible with traditional survey research.

Political Thematic Apperception Measure (PTAM). The only visual semi-projective technique used is Knutson's PTAM, originally developed for administration to small children. This method asks the respondent to create a story about each of ten drawings of scenes involving various types of personal interactions. (To facilitate the interviews, undergraduates and campaign volunteers were given sets of five pictures, with alternating sets being administered.) The most common reaction from adults was a brief description of what was going on.

Knutson used these pictures to assess children's "pre-political" ideologies, along with the basic dimensions of feelings about legalized force, human nature (cooperative/competitive), authority, leaders/followers (decision-making), security, youth (generational differences), locus of authority, group/individual relations, poverty, and systemic loyalty (Knutson, 1974a, pp. 3-4.) Broad generalizations regarding these dimensions can be made, and there is a sense that these stories/

descriptions may be providing something less articulated or more basic than specific political attitudes; however, caution must be used to prevent over generalizations or overly speculative interpretations. Most of the politically experienced respondents did not see much utility to this method, but often the data generated here were supported by responses to other semi-projective methods or to the questionnaire scales. In other words, these data may be more insightful than many respondents realize or admit, primarily because of the theoretical significance of these basic dimensions to political reasoning. Many subsequent political attitudes are structured by these primary orientations, developed early in life (Searing, Schwartz and Lind, 1973; Searing, Wright and Rabinowitz, 1976).

These pictures were effective at stimulating imaginative political thinking (Merelman, 1971). Young respondents, particularly those who were dealing with politics hypothetically and were uncomfortable with reasoning through a political dilemma, could comment eloquently about the visual situations presented by the PTAM. This tenative relationship--highly imaginative, visually stimulated stories with simplistic or illogical story completions and very limited word associations and sentence completions--would support Merelman's findings of the lack of relations between imaginative political thinking and the styles of political thinking effected by cognitive development (Merelman, 1973; Merelman, 1977). Apparently, these people see politics as broadly entertaining, yet not vitally connected to their own life situations. Their imaginative fantasies were usually very dramatic, naive and implausible, imparting a story book air. I believe visual stimuli are more useful and appropriate for the less politically experienced or sophisticated, and could be influenced by such factors as a heavy media dependence and an attenuated political belief system.

Unfinished stories-political dilemmas. Ten hypothetical situations were presented to the respondents in this segment of the interview, using alternating sets of six. The names of the protagonists were changed to match the sex of the respondent, except in the Heinz Moral Dilemma story. In addition to the moral dilemma, the remaining nine situations presented political dilemmas, including Sarat's pollution problem and Patterson's protest situation. The stories include:

(1) Neighbor's Feelings--prejudice among neighbors and political leaders.

(2) Running a Meeting--role of leadership, rules, procedures and uses of dissent in organizations.

(3) Jury Problem--judicial problems with bad laws, punishments and civil disobedience.

(4) Protest Permit--role of elected leaders, dissent, violence, procedural protections.

(5) Zoning Board--problems of eminent domain, opposition to elected leaders, range of acceptable political acts.

(6) Robbery--factual guilt versus legal guilt, due process, rights of accused, abuse of law.

(7) New Group in Town--tolerance of nonconformity, political activities, social homogeneity and religious freedom.

(8) Pollution--responsibility for stopping pollution, social and political ramifications of regulation.

(9) Economy and Role of Government--role of government versus free enterprise solutions in helping the needy.

(10) Heinz Moral Dilemma--morality of stealing to save a life.

The first nine were split, each respondent completing four or five stories; all respondents completed the last story. All the stories created and those adapted from other studies were designed to present a political dilemma, a situation which should require some weighing of alternative courses of action based upon different personal or political values. There were no right or easy answers, and any answer provided could require some justification. An account of the respondent's answer was needed (Bennett, 1980a), and the account could be challenged or modified under questioning. Each story completion was probed in order to elicit a full account or a contextually embedded answer. The respondents could place any qualifications they felt necessary to justify their answers. This opportunity to supply the context and to explain any restrictions was appreciated by all, especially by the politically active and/or those with highly differentiated and articulate belief systems. In contrast, the Likert-type scales caused some irritation since they might not provide enough information for a clear choice or because mediating circumstances might exist.

Not all respondents clearly perceived the dilemma in each story, but each respondent found at least one, if not more, of the situations to require serious thought and a consideration of various alternatives. The politically knowledgeable respondents are more sensitive to the political dilemmas, but quite often

their solutions were already structured by deeply held values. That is, political knowledge and articulate belief systems did not paralyze respondents; they could recognize the conflict but readily justify their answers. Their accounts were structured by deeply held political values or beliefs.

Occasionally, a respondent would be unable to resolve a dilemma but could explain the reasons for feeling cross-pressured. Quite often, these unresolved stories provided more insight into the process of political reasoning and the political values involved than did the resolved situations.

Scholars who have used semi-projective methods have noted a number of strong advantages associated with these methods and with the data generated. Semi-projective methods provide very rich, elaborate verbal data regarding political attitudes and political reasoning, usually in the form of transcribed interviews. While this data may be, and has been, analyzed in a quantitative fashion similar to the traditional survey data, I believe a more sensitive and theoretically justified application of the methods would treat the data as qualitative and basically holistic in nature. (See Rosgengren, 1981, for a sophisticated examination of quantitative and qualitative content analysis and the tensions between the two approaches). Projective and semi-projective methods have their historical and theoretical roots in diagnostic and clinical psychological methods. These methodological roots rely upon holistic personality theories, which "consider each personality as an open system, with its own logical imperatives and organizing principles" (Knutson, 1973b, p. 33), rather than upon the trait theories of personality, which underlie most survey-oriented, attitudinal analysis (See Diesing, 1971, Chapter Ten).

As Diesing describes the holistic methodological perspective, it

> includes the belief that human systems tend to develop a characteristic wholeness or integrity. They are not simply a loose collection of traits or wants or reflexes or variables of any sort . . . ; they have a unity that manifests itself in nearly every part (Diesing, 1971, p. 137).

The assumption is that this wholeness or organizing principle guides the individual's political functioning and that this principle can be assessed by the projected responses to these techniques. The whole is reflected in the part.

A related aspect of the underlying, holistic, methodological theory is evident in the manner in which respondents are treated.

> The holist's belief in the primacy of the subject matter is closely related to his more general attitude of respect for human beings. Human beings, he feels, are not things and should not be experimented upon, controlled, duped and generally used in the name of science (Diesing, 1971, p. 141).

Clearly, the application of semi-projective methods represents this perspective, in that it requires a personal, reciprocal interaction, in which the researcher is recognized as having the right to ask questions, but not to superimpose answers or meanings upon the respondent. The unrestricted response possibilities underscore the respondents' ability to provide personal, meaningful and valid answers of their own creation. The respondents' interpretations are seen as valid, yet not necessarily as the final word. The problem of "false consciousness" is still present, and the researcher may contradict or refute a respondent's interpretation; yet, the interpretation must be recognized in the research process.

Thus, an holistic analysis of semi-projective data employs the various critical analytical methods used in phenomenological analysis of political belief systems. Lane describes these as: explication, exegesis, thematic analysis, classification and typology, structural analysis, linguistic analysis, logical analysis and reconstruction (Lane, 1973, pp. 89-90). While these methods of data analysis do not preclude quantification, only the most rudimentary quantification would be justified. (See Diesing, 1971, Chapter 12, "Holistic Uses of Statistics" for a discussion of this problem.) Much more likely and in keeping with the holistic perspective is the presentation of real, pseudonymous persons and an analysis of them as theoretically significant cases or ideal types. Lane's work in Political Ideology (1962) and in Political Thinking and Consciousness (1969) uses this format, as does the work of Smith, Bruner and White (1956) and, more recently, Fenno (1978) and Hotsch (1980). These works do not use semi-projective techniques, but rely on other holistic methods, such as depth interviews and participant observation.

Perhaps another way of describing the use of semi-projective methods would be to say that they examine the vertical structure of political attitudes, the personal links of attitudes to values and to basic beliefs, by intensively studying small samples; this type of work leads to idiographic explanations. Survey research work takes an extensive approach, studying large numbers of randomly selected individuals. Survey work can assess the distribution of particular attitudes among a large population or can measure the horizontal relations among political attitudes. Converse's notions of constraint fall into this latter type of work; inferences about the vertical structure of attitudes or attitude patterns can be made but such inferences are problematic

(Binford, 1981). This distinction between intensive, idiographic analysis and extensive, nomothetic analysis is discussed by Lasswell (1948), Brown (1974), and Rood (1979). The distinction is implicit in the analysis of political belief systems made by Lane (1973) and Bennett (1980b).

Clearly, the two approaches, while very different, are not antithetical but complementary in nature. They tell us different things about people and their political attitudes, and each has its appropriate and inappropriate uses. For example, it would be ludicrous to predict election outcomes from semi-projective interviews. On the other hand, semi-projective interviews might give us insights into the process of selecting among several candidates. Many campaigns are now using unstructured, focused interviews to complement extensive poll data (Sabato, 1981, p. 77). The style of reasoning in such decisions is better assessed using a semi-projective or a depth interview format.

The development of significant information from such intensive methods must be carefully guided by theory, both substantive and methodological. Brown (1974) and Herbst (1970) provide good introductions to the differences in intensive, small sample research, as does the sociological literature on qualitative methods (Glaser and Strauss, 1967; Schwartz and Jacob, 1979). The procedures for selecting respondents should follow theoretical criteria rather than random selection techniques. Given a restricted sample size, individuals are selected as representatives of theoretically significant types. (See Brown, 1980, for a thoughtful development and application of theoretical sample selection and instrument development using Q methodology, another holistic method for studying political attitudes.)

Insensitivity to theoretical criteria or a misapplication of semi-projective methods to provide merely descriptive data about larger populations can be short-sighted and ultimately unproductive. In other words, the analysis of political attitudes and styles of reasoning among eighteen campaign volunteers using semi-projective techniques will not give us an understanding about how all campaign volunteers think about politics. However, if the sample is carefully drawn, such an analysis could tell us how certain <u>types</u> of volunteers think. The obvious necessity for good empirical work would be a body of theory about campaign volunteers which would guide the selection of cases. The utility of combining semi-projective techniques with other methods in a multiple-method or triangulated approach is strongly advised.

The development of a multiple method or triangulated approach (Denzin, 1970) permits the most thorough analysis of semi-projective data. Such an approach seeks to combine the strengths and minimize the weaknesses of the methods selected in the research design or preparation stage. The inclusion of methods with very different theoretical and epistemological

underpinnings creates a tension in the work which can be exploited by a sensitive and creative researcher to produce very insightful analyses. Several of the most significant works on political attitudes and political reasoning have employed such a triangulated design (See Adorno et al, 1969; Smith, Bruner and White, 1956; Lane, 1962). The researcher must bear in mind that the methods used may be based on very different conceptions of personality and direct the analysis accordingly. The holistic conception of personality appears to be a more inclusive approach and can incorporate scales or survey techniques. Efforts to incorporate holistic concepts into trait methods amenable to survey measurement have not been successful or satisfying (See Knutson, 1972; Simpson, 1971).

Given the relationship between the underlying holistic personality theory and the holistic methodology, what are the particular advantages and disadvantages of using semi-projective methods to study political attitudes and political reasoning?

A primary advantage, noted by all researchers who have used these methods, is the substantial rapport developed between interviewer and respondent. These methods are engaging and tend to draw the respondent into the research process. The attitude of respect noted for holistic methods earlier produces increased cooperation; the research becomes a joint effort. Once this rapport is gained, the interviewer can probe into sensitive or private areas which might not be accessible using other methods. Given the hypothetical nature of the unfinished stories, the interviewer can play a devil's advocate role and challenge the account presented, pushing the respondent to justify answers, usually without offending or alienating the respondent. An additional advantage sometimes noted is less dissembling; this advantage comes from the rapport, the very intricacy of the answers required, and the probing which is employed.

Several scholars have selected semi-projective methods because of their utility with young respondents, or with any respondents lacking verbal/linguistic skills. The visual semi-projective techniques seem to be particularly appropriate with these respondents. The applicability to cross-national or highly diverse populations also is worth noting.

The amount and quality of data are quite important. Semi-projective methods provide rich, idiographic, naturalistic attitudinal data which integrate the cognitive, affective and conative components researchers are so fond of separating analytically. These methods generate data which present attitudes as they are used in political thinking. An additional advantage, which has appeared in some interviews currently being conducted, is the tendency for the hypothetical situation (or the sentence completion) to stimulate spontaneous analogies in the minds of the respondents ("Say, that's just like . . . ."). Such spontaneous references give clear insights into the manner in

which respondents anchor their political belief systems to current events.

Another advantage with student populations is the lowering of test expectations, or purely cognitive, "textbook" answers, which may be a result of the demand characteristics of the interview situation. The format of the unfinished stories and of the visual stimuli emphasizes that there are no textbook answers to these questions, no correct responses.

In all, these methods provide deep and thorough "vertical" information about the political attitudes held and about the ways these attitudes interact, affecting the respondent's political perceptions and cognitions. In providing this kind of information, the semi-projective methods are similar to depth or unstructured interviews. Their main advantages over depth interviews lie in (1) their using standard, comparable stimuli and (2) their efficiency at generating attitudinal data over a wide range of topics in a much shorter interview session. The insights into the style of political reasoning are much more likely to come from resolving political dilemmas hypothetically than from the often rambling discourse of a depth interview.

Semi-projective methods are certainly not perfect, and their disadvantages must be noted as well. The major drawback comes from the initial form and quantity of the data: words. To be used fully, the responses must be tape recorded and transcribed, a lengthy process, or written down verbatim, a technique which can make the interview very choppy and difficult to administer. Data management becomes quite difficult in that even a forty-five minute interview can fill 15 to 18 pages of transcription. With only twenty respondents, this becomes 300 to 360 of typed verbal data. Unfortunately, such qualitative data are not as easily condensed or summarized as are more quantitative data, and usually a fairly elaborate indexing and coding system must be developed and applied. At this point, the research process resembles content analysis, and any person embarking on such a project should be familiar with content analysis procedures (See Holsti, 1969; Babbie, 1979; Rosengren, 1981).

Coding procedures may be developed around a variety of themes, and the same material may be coded according to several different systems. This variability of coding schemes can be both an advantage and a disadvantage, since the lack of consensual coding schemes reduces the reliability of coded data and makes cumulative work very difficult. On the other hand, too restrictive a coding scheme may impede taking advantage of serendipitous results or of the general flexibility of the method. Quite often, the efforts to make semi-projective coding schemes more rigorous and systematic have been quite cumbersome and may not increase reliability. The current coding manual for Kohlberg's Moral Dilemmas Test is several hundred pages long, and the reliability of the coding of stages of moral reasoning has not yet been convincingly validated. The earlier discussion of

semi-projective methods as holistic methods does not preclude quantification, but the most appropriate quantitative analysis would be rudimentary, rarely rising above an ordinal level of measurement. The inductive development of a typology of cases or the application of a previous typology to the data may encourage an holistic analysis and a comparative analysis of ideal-typical cases. Still, some type of coding or indexing is necessary for effective data management and analysis.

An additional vulnerability is the degree of personal interaction between interviewer and respondent. Some feel that such interaction may lead to bias or distortion, with the interviewer eliciting answers which suit his or her own personal values or research hypotheses. Putting words into the mouths of respondents is certainly a danger; yet, a trained interviewer can learn to avoid such tendencies, and a data analyst will learn to disregard such responses. The problems of response set and respondent acquiescence in survey research may be analogous dangers, dangers which careful design, training and analysis can reduce or remove. The lack of uniform probes can be a problem, creating fuller, more detailed answers to some questions from some respondents. In sum, the responses are more consistent and comparable than those of depth interviews, yet less so than those of standardized surveys or questionnaires.

Research values and expectations may distort the exegesis and interpretation of interview material, but such biases exist even in quantitative data analysis. All empirical research must be carefully examined to determine the influence of the researcher's values. A useful method of recognizing such value biases is to have another person, with different values or expectations, read the full transcripts and question the interpretations made.

The final disadvantage or problem is the form in which data are presented, usually as extended quotations. Questions inevitably arise about editing responses, correcting grammar, excluding extraneous comments and the like. Critics fear drastic and distorting editing, and yet no alternative exists, except providing the total interview. Likewise, the arguments made must rest on plausibility and theoretical significance, not on the strength or the statistical significance of correlations. A very common reaction from quantitatively trained social scientists is anxiety and trepidation, which leads to a cautious and conservative presentation of findings.

In comparing semi-projective techniques to survey research, the former can present people as total entities and can help us see, as Lane says, "what goes with what and why", from the respondent's point of view (Lane, 1973, p. 100). Respondents can offer explanations and justifications for their accounts, and these justifications may be examined and criticized by the analyst. In survey research, we can see "what goes with what", but the why must be inferred, often through statistical patterns

of responses among large populations. Surveys can generate data on the distribution of attitudes among large groups, and statistical relations among attitudes can be measured by very sophisticated procedures. Broad generalizations can be hypothesized. On the other hand, semi-projective methods provide insight into the reasoning processes and the causal antecedent of political attitudes and beliefs, as the respondent sees them.

Semi-projective methods provide a developed context within which an answer can be placed. Many scholars are beginning to find limitations to survey data on very complex political or social issues precisely because this context is missing. In analyzing various ways in which support for civil liberties has been assessed, Gibson and Bingham conclude, "(I)t is becoming increasingly clear that context-free measures of democratic attitudes are of little utility. Instead, a context, either hypothetical or actual, must be specified in order to accurately gauge public sentiment" (Gibson and Bingham, 1979, pp. 35-36). Naturally, semi-projective methods provide this context (See Patterson, 1979).

A similar limitation appears regarding belief systems and constraint or styles of reasoning (Binford, 1981). No one would deny the substantial impact that style of reasoning has in structuring belief systems and political behavior. However, the analysis of styles of reasoning by using statistical regularities has many inherent problems, as Barton and Parsons (1977) among others (Lane, 1973; Bennett, 1980b; Dawson, 1979) point out. A major difficulty comes in detecting "sophisticated" reasoning from "inconsistent" reasoning; this difficulty underlies the whole area of voter rationality and issue voting. After examining the standard survey analysis of beliefs systems and reasoning, Barton and Parsons suggest a very common-sensical solution:

> To distinguish the sophisticate from the unpoliticized individual we might ask them to explain their seemingly inconsistent responses. The sophisticate could do so, while the unpoliticized respondent could not . . . . This requires going beyond standardized questions to open-ended probes concerning the reasons and reliably coding the results. (Barton and Parsons, 1977, p. 178).

As I have demonstrated, semi-projective methods provide a number of advantages over completely open-ended or depth interviews.

Bennett's thorough analysis of political perception and cognition (Bennett, 1981) underscores the necessity of developing a more thorough understanding of the complexity of political thinking. His focus on individual cognitive maps or Preliminary

Cognitive Representations can be related directly to semi-projective methods, which seek to ground the individual's perceptions and cognitions in hypothetical situations. Bennett believes:

> (R)esearch and theory are turning increasingly to the exploration of situational factors that have systematic effects on the selection and use of belief processes. Models of belief systems are becoming models of situational and behaviorally mediated thinking (Bennett, 1981, p. 159).

Semi-projective methods are useful in illuminating the way political values and beliefs structure our cognitive representations of political situations.

In order to highlight these methods and to show the type of data that can be generated, let us briefly examine portions of two transcripts which used semi-projective methods (See Appendix B). The total interview transcript is nine pages long for Mrs. Thompson and fifteen pages long for Ms. Anderson, so only the word associations, sentence completions, one visual story, and five unfinished stories are reproduced. The full texts of the stories are in Appendix A.

Mrs. Thompson was a Reagan volunteer in 1980 and has a moderately active history of political campaign activity, including work for Democrats, as well as Republicans. She is in her early forties, married and a mother. She is wealthy, highly educated, and clearly an articulate political thinker, without being totally committed to political activity. At the time of the interview (early Summer, 1982), she was not working for any political candidate or group. She was very skeptical of the PTAT and gave very cursory descriptions of the pictures, as her transcript shows.

The holistic impression given is one of a thoughtful woman, who was drawn to liberal candidates and policies but who has become more conservative with time and changing life circumstances. Her husband is a conservative Republican banker, and her views apparently share his perspective without totally rejecting her earlier liberal ideas. She respects order, authority and political institutions without being authoritarian or punitive. She mixes compassion for those less fortunate than she is with pragmatism, recognizing the limited effectiveness of many idealistic solutions to political dilemmas. She is very sensitive to the need for compromise and for practical solutions; she does not live in a world of consistent ideological absolutes but instead, as she says, "Just shades of grey."

Her responses to the word associations show a strong evaluative pattern with complex answers. She links ideology with political parties and with her personal political identity. She supports traditional political activities and is suspicious of, but not frightened by, non-traditional groups or activities.

The sentence completions show a discomfort with broad generalizations (the "always" modifiers) and an awareness of the abstract, normative political rights and protections we have, while recognizing the contemporary political environment we face. She appreciates the necessity of procedural protections and regulations; yet, she objects to the amount of regulation and its potential effects. Mrs. Thompson exhibits sophisticated and dialectic reasoning abilities. In many regards, she calls to mind the traditionally socially responsible personality described by Berkowitz and Lutterman (1968-69).

The second respondent, Ms. Anderson, is a college undergraduate in her early twenties. She is not married but is living away from home and working part-time. She has not been active in politics, and at the time of the interview she was taking an introductory course in American government from another professor. Her word associations are much more simplistic and show the cognitive pattern described earlier. She confuses the left/right ideological terminology, but she correctly attributes ideological preferences for political parties and groups.

The sentence completions begin to show more complete attitudes, and her suspicion and skepticism of political figures and institutions become clear. She believes that politicians and political institutions are often contradictory and unfair. She is very sensitive about discrimination and prejudice toward minorities and women.

Her story to accompany picture #7 of the PTAT shows the intricacy and detail of imaginative political thinking, and her description underscores threats and violence as a method of conflict resolution. She gives the picture a dramatic and episodic interpretation. In contrast, Mrs. Thompson's description of the same picture shows the cursory or predominantly descriptive response more characteristic of the politically active.

Ms. Anderson expresses cynicism and skepticism in her completion of the pollution story, and she has difficulty assigning responsibility for the problem. She sees government as being motivated by self-interest and initially short-sighted, but eventually acting to force compliance with the law. Government, rather than the polluting industry, is viewed as the cause of the closing, and government will have to take responsibility for caring for the people unemployed.

Her immediate response to the new group story is to expect harassment and violence toward the group. Institutional channels

for conflict resolution did not occur to her until her answer was probed. While aware of religious freedoms and their protection, she doubts that such protections will stand up against social pressure. The possibility for rapprochement does exist, but not in the South; because of her perception of the current climate of opinion, Ms. Anderson believes such acceptance or harmony is unlikely.

In general, Ms. Anderson seems to be very sensitive to power differentials between groups, social pressures, discrimination, and violent resolution of disputes. She links the situations to current events (Jonestown, Moonies, Middle East) which are violent or not readily resolved using traditional political methods. Her political attitudes show the influence of the media and manifest socialization, such as political science class, but very little experience with political solutions or political decision-making is indicated. She does not show highly dialectical reasoning, and her style of political reasoning leans heavily toward the imaginative rather than the cognitive. The political world remains hypothetical to her, not directly experienced.

As this discussion and analysis of semi-projective techniques and the brief heuristic examples have shown, these methods offer an effective alternative to the previously used methods: depth interviews and survey research. Semi-projective methods provide more uniform stimuli and a more efficient format for generating examples of political reasoning than depth interviews do. The data are richer, deeper and more complex than that provided by surveys. Semi-projective methods give the analyst an insight into political attitudes and political reasoning in use. Hopefully, that the further development and theoretically guided application of semi-projective methods will complement and augment our knowledge of political attitudes and political reasoning.

APPENDIX A

Word Associations

1. Politics
2. Good citizen
3. Democracy
4. Liberal
5. Conservative
6. Radical
7. Environmentalist
8. Big Business
9. Unions
10. Republicans
11. Democrats
12. Elections
13. Communism
14. the President
15. Congress
16. Supreme Court
17. Bureaucrats
18. the Governor
19. the Armed Forces
20. Demonstrations
21. Feminists
22. Media
23. Interest Groups

Sentence Completions

1. The Democrats always _____.
2. In the long run, our government seems to _____.
3. Those people in Congress _____.
4. The police usually _____.
5. If more people were involved in politics, politics would _____.
6. I am most proud of our government's _____.
7. The Republicans always _____.

8. As far as politics is concerned, women _____.

9. Most minority groups in America have _____.

10. Most politicians seem to _____.

11. When it comes to voting, I _____.

12. The thing I hate about our government is _____.

13. Our best political leader _____.

14. When I see demonstrations, I _____.

15. In America, a person can _____.

16. Our most important right is _____.

17. I believe that our courts are _____.

Unfinished Stories

The Protest

In a small town, a group of people want to protest against bad treatment of poor people. The leaders of the demonstration go to the mayor and ask for a permit to hold a meeting and a parade. The leaders say they have a right to tell others about the problems of poor people. The mayor decides to give them the permit. However, other people who live in town hear about the protest and are against it. They are afraid that some violence might occur and some houses and stores might be damaged. The townspeople get very angry at the mayor and demand that he take away the permit that he gave to the protest leaders. What do you think the mayor will do? Why? (Based on Patterson, 1979.)

* * * * *

Robbery

A friend's house was broken into, and several expensive items were stolen. The police arrested the thief, but, in questioning him, they violated several technical, legal procedures. Therefore, some of the evidence against him was obtained illegally. Then what happened?

* * * * *

Running A Meeting

Bill/Mary has been elected as head of a local organization, by a sizeable majority. (Neighborhood group, social club, PTA, etc.). After some time, he/she realizes that for the group to accomplish its goals effectively, he/she can't allow some of the members to take part in making group decisions; their participation is disruptive and slows down the process of making decisions. He/she refuses to recognize them or allow them to speak at meetings. At the next group meeting, these excluded people object to Bill/Mary's behavior. What happens?

* * * * *

The Zoning Board

In the last election, the local mayor was elected by a sizeable majority; you and the Smiths voted for him. The city is currently expanding its parks and street system. The mayor feels that in order to be fair and efficient, the zoning board (which is not elected) should have full power to assess, evaluate and acquire all necessary property, regardless of the feelings of the owners. The owners can be required to sell their property at the evaluated price. The Smiths' home is about to be taken. What do they do?

* * * * *

A Jury Problem

You are serving as a member of a jury in criminal court. The defendant in the present case is clearly guilty of breaking the law in question, but some of the members of the jury think that the law he/she broke is <u>not</u> a good one and does not deserve to be obeyed. The Judge says that the jury's decision must be based on the facts of the case and not on whether the law broken is good or bad. Again some members of the jury feel that punishing a person for breaking a bad law is not right. What happens next?

* * * * *

New Group in Town

An unusual religious group has been buying land in your community. They have some very unconventional beliefs and practices and they plan to use the land to build a religious community for several hundred of their followers from all over

the country. Many people in your community are very upset about this intrusion, and a number of anti-group rallies have been held. The religious group has responded with its own rallies and programs. The town is very tense. What happens next?

* * * * *

Pollution

A company continues to pollute a river near your town, even though the state legislature has passed a law requiring all industries to stop such pollution. The owner of the company claims that the cost of complying with the law would force him out of business, and many people in the community would lose their jobs. What do you think will be done? Is this the right thing to do? Why? (Based on Sarat, 1975.)

* * * * *

Neighbors' Feelings

One weekend, while talking with Bill/Mary and some neighbors, one of your neighbors makes a nasty comment about a group of people, not realizing that Bill/Mary belongs to that group. The neighbor goes on to say that he knows for a fact that several of the local political leaders share his feelings and are going "to do something about them." What does Bill/Mary do?

* * * * *

Government and Economy

Bill/Mary and his/her friend Sam/Alice were talking about poor people and government programs one day. Bill/Mary said that s/he could not understand the need for welfare programs to help poor people. She/he says, "In our system, everyone has an equal chance to get ahead, if he works hard and really takes advantage of the opportunities he has. When the government interferes, it only messes things up."

Sam/Alice disagrees, and answers, "A person can work very hard, and still not have an equal chance to get ahead. Poor people <u>never</u> get an equal opportunity, and that is why the government has to help them." What happens next?

* * * * *

Moral Judgment Interview
(from Kohlberg's Moral Dilemmas)

In Europe, a woman was near death from a special kind of cancer. There was one drug that the doctors thought might save her. It was a form of radium that a druggist in the same town had recently discovered. The drug was expensive to make, but the druggist was charging ten times what the drug cost him to make. He paid $200 for the radium and charged $2,000 for a small dose of the drug. The sick woman's husband, Heinz, went to everyone he knew to borrow the money, but he could only get together about $1,000, which is half of what it cost. He told the druggist that his wife was dying, and asked him to sell it cheaper or let him pay later. But the druggist said, "No, I discovered the drug and I'm going to make money from it." So Heinz gets desperate and considers breaking into the man's store to steal the drug for his wife. Should Heinz steal the drug?

APPENDIX B

(Portions of an interview with "Mrs. Thompson")

Politics: Basically, I don't like them.

Good Citizen: We need more of them.

Democracy: Excellent.

Liberal: Tends to go overboard.

Conservative: I feel comfortable.

Radical: I feel very uncomfortable. (Laughs slightly)

Environmentalist: Positive. In favor of environmentalism and the preservation. Sometimes we have to sacrifice things that we're in favor of before we (garbled).

Big Business: Nothing wrong with it, although there can be.

Unions: Served as a very fine purpose, and now (pauses) it tends to apply its energy in areas that are not as significant as those initially.

Republicans: Conservatives. More to my political liking than Democrats.

Democrats: I used to be a Democrat. But I feel that they have done the same thing the unions have done.

Elections: Absolutely necessary. Thank God, we have them.

Communism: A grave danger. Not fully appreciated by people in the U.S. My response to this is from my own version. We lived in West Berlin for five years right next to the wall. So I'm very aware of what Communism has resulted in. And that's it.

The President: Poor man. (laughs)

Congress: Too (garbled)

Supreme Court: Respect. Necessary, been doing a good job.

Bureaucrats: Too many cooks stirring the broth.

The Governor: Too big.

Armed Forces: Absolutely necessary. Not respected as they should be.

Demonstrations: In extreme cases they might be necessary, but I'm opposed to them.

Feminists: I don't like them. That is, I don't like the movement. In essence I am a feminist. But I don't like tactics of feminism.

Media: Well, the dissemination of information is very good, but it has, it tends . . . I feel it take approaches sometimes that are not as objective as they should be.

Interest Groups: Great. Whoever has an interest should get out and fight for it.

Sentence Completions

1. The Democrats always The Democrats always? I can't go for always and never, or whatever. Try usually.

I: Okay, how about the Democrats usually Okay, Democrats. If I had to finish it, Democrats usually promise more than they can realistically deliver.

2. In the long run, our government seems to put (garbled) .

3. Those people in Congress have over complicated things.

4. The police usually do a reasonable job.

5. If more people were involved in politics, it would complicate things. (laughs)

6. I am most proud of our government's beginning conceptions. The way our Constitution (garbled) and Declaration of Independence.

7. The Republicans always, usually. I'll pass.

8. As far as politics is concerned, women well, look, two things come to the fore, can be very useful and also there's no reason to differentiate women from men.

9. Most minority groups in America have (pause) heavens, better off than if they were a minority anywhere else in the world. Even if they do have some problems.

10. Most politicians seem to (pause) I think, it's a difficult job. I think it's a miracle we have people who want to be in office.

11. When it comes to voting, I am conservative.

12. The thing I hate about our government is regulations. Over regulations, I'd say. We need regulations, certainly. Certainly. But, we have gotten to the point where, layer upon layer. Over doing it.

13. Our best political leader (pause) should inspire people with his goals and purposes.

14. When I see demonstrations, I avoid them.

15. In America, a person can accomplish more than he can most any other place in the world and achieve most things that he is . . . desires to attain if he's willing to work for them. He or she.

16. Our most important right is free speech.

17. I believe that our courts are overloaded.

PTAM #7

R: Some people are near a burned out structure, and they are sad looking. They all look as if they've not been well cared for.

Robbery

I: Finish the story.

R: Well, as they stand now, the information that's illegally, technically, illegally obtained would probably be inadmissible to court, and its chances of their (garbled) the police. And I think that was very wrong. I think there needs to be a reasonable re-evaluation of the procedures. Knowing that in the heat of a pursuit the police cannot whip out their manual and, you know, proceed A, B, C, D, E, F, and make sure everything's all right. After all, the person who violates the law is the one who needs to be caught and kept away from other people.

I: Okay. So you think. Let me see if I got all this right. You think that there are some sort of rules for reasonable procedures, but that . . .

R: Oh, yes. Definitely. I think that we, probably, though, again over loaded things. Over regulating. Basics, yes.

I: And then in that over regulation . . .

R: As a result people are being, are not being, (pause) are not receiving full treatment that they richly deserve under the law. The victims have been, have a right, (I: Have been ignored?) have been ignored.

Pollution

I: What do you think will be done?

R: Well, if it's the law, and did you say it's the law? If he's violating the law, his business would have to be closed and he would have to stop polluting. He has to obey the law. Now there's a possibility that they could bring some kind of political solution in there by coming to some kind of agreement which is _____ cheaper to the state or whatever. But if it's a necessary industry then perhaps if he cleaned it up to the extent that can be economically feasible. But if he can't . . .

I: Is that the right thing to do?

R: There is no right or wrong, just shades of grey. (laughs)

I: A wise statement.

R: Just shades of grey (laughs)

I: Okay. Let's explore this a little. So, you see the role of government in this situation, first of all, as setting the law, but as also being responsive to the interests and the needs of the businessman?

R: Well, and the citizen. After all if you don't have a job, it is nice to have a clean river, but if you and your wife are going to get turned out of your house and the same thing would happen to five hundred people down the street, you might be willing to accept a little bit of dirt in the river in exchange for your economic security. And that's when other, remember when we talked about environmentalists initially

I: Mhmn. That's why I said this was going to be a good one. Okay. What about other alternatives besides regulations? In other words, what about government involving itself in the clean up efforts?

R: You mean subsidizing? (I: Mhmn.) Possible . . . And, again, it's gotta be a pragmatic thing, what is going to serve the best interest in the end of as many people as possible without trying to have an ideal solution(?).

I: What about . . . Suppose the government passed the law and the business closed and the people lost their jobs. What's

the government's responsibility to those people? Or does it have one?

R: Well, ultimately, the people pass the law. They elect the people who wrote the law. So the people are responsible for themselves to a certain extent. They may not have been directly responsible, in this situation. The government would have served them better by making some accommodation with business. But once they have been deprived of a job, I think that as a whole we have an obligation to see that no one dies of hunger or lack of basic medical care or shelter. And the government would have to make efforts to help them find other jobs elsewhere. That has to be a very basic need, a basic level of assistance because you cannot. We can't have all the other people carrying those people on their shoulders, see.

Government and Economy:

I: What happens next?

R: They will never come to an agreement. (laughs)

I: Okay. I've had that answer to this one before.

R: And I can't solve that dilemma, either. Nobody is equal. Period. And nobody can even hope to work or aspire them to equal treatment or equality . . . to start out with equal make up or anything. I think that the direction of our country has been that we want to help people. And I think that is the right direction. I think that again, it reaches the point, which we've had layer after layer after layer of it. And I'm not saying that people on welfare are living richly or well or anything like that, but I do think we still have to look at the total picture and what can we practically accomplish, what can we take from other areas and direct in this area. We've got. Our poor people are so much better off than the poor people are in other countries anywhere in the United States. I've been there. That having directly seen these things, I find it difficult to view a welfare home that has a television set because I don't think a television set is a necessity. They're fortunate to have that. And I'm gonna sound like a very harsh person, I know. But it's a world wide reality. Most people don't even have indoor plumbing. And they're not even poverty people. In Berlin, where we lived many, many workers lived in flats where they had to walk up four flights of stairs and the bathroom was downstairs in the court yard. And it's a community bath. And these are not people on welfare. So our welfare people are reasonably well taken care of. But our aspirations in this country are so high that the gap is very great, and consequently, many people, I think, feel that they are not adequately

cared _____. That doesn't help you any, and it doesn't me any. And if you ever let anybody hear this . . .

I: No. No one'll hear it. (R: . . . I'll be in trouble.) If I quote you, I'll use a pseudonym. Okay. Do you think that governmental solutions are as good as private industries' solutions? Do you differentiate between those two?

R: They can be. A solution is a solution. It doesn't matter who comes up with it. I think that government tends to be less careful with its money because all the government has to do to obtain it is to raise the tax, use deficit financing, inflate the economy, or whatever, and has billions and millions, more dollars available to spend on their every wants. Whereas the private person, the private person or the private industry has to get out and earn that money to then be able to say I want to put it in this or that. Consequently, I think that government solutions tend to be more idealistic and perhaps more closely to what we would all ideally want. But then it get, makes things difficult (?)

(Portions of an interview with Ms. Anderson)

Politics: Government.

Good Citizen: Law Abiding, law abider.

Democracy: There's a lot there . . . Freedom.

Liberal: Right.

Conservative: Left.

Radical: Change.

Environmentalist: Phrases or words. Nature.

Big Business: Conservative.

Unions: Working Class.

Republicans: Conservative.

Democrats: (pause) Liberal.

Elections: (pause) Voting.

Communism: Russia.

The President: Chief Executive.

Congress: Two Chambered.

Supreme Court: Aristocracy (laughs).

Bureaucrats: Red Tape.

The Governor: (laughs) Redneck!

Armed Forces: Bad News (laughs).

Demonstrations: Trying to get points across.

Media: Distortions.

Feminist: (pause) Equality.

Sentence completions

1. The Democrats always (Laughs) repeats, (long pause) Win in the South.
2. In the long run our government seems to Contradict itself.
3. Those people in Congress (pause) Don't really strike me as doing good for all the people.
4. The police usually Have a lot of prejudice.
5. If more people were involved in politics, politics would Be more for the people.
6. I am most proud of our government's (pause) Concern for the environment.
7. The Republicans always Work for themselves rather than for other people.
8. As far as politics is concerned, women Are just now beginning to enter into politics.
9. Most minority groups in America have (pause) A hard time.
10. Most politicians seem to Contradict themselves.
11. When it comes to voting I Am very good about voting.
12. The thing I hate about our government is The way it seems to be getting more and more powerful.
13. Our best political leader (pause) Are those that know how to make compromises that will be for the good of everybody involved.

14. When I see demonstrations, I Tend to be a little bit skeptical.

15. In America a person can Can do almost anything as long as they're middle class whites.

16. Our important right is Freedom of Speech.

17. I believe that our courts are Not really fair.

PTAH #7

R: This is obviously in a desert in the Middle East somewhere there's a house here that looks like it's been destroyed, somehow. Though I don't know really who would have a house in the desert and there's a man and looks like, a woman and they're very, very upset and the man is crying and there's another man walking away. Now this man that's walking away has probably done something to these people that somehow or other destroyed their house, destroyed some part of their life that was important to them or something. He walked away from it all and just left them there all by themselves. Just in the middle of the desert.

Unfinished Stories

I: Pollution Story

R: Well, I imagine that the government will probably be on the side of the business. It probably won't be on the side of the environmentalist. Simply because they don't want to add people to their welfare rolls if they don't have to. If they can do a little bit more polluting to keep people off the welfare rolls I think that the big company is going to win out. The environment is going to lose.

I: Is that the right thing to do?

R: Oh no, I mean, well, it depends on how you look at it. You have to look at it from both sides, it's kind of hard to say because people may lose their jobs but it's also bad for our environment. It's bad for everybody because they're breathing in all this pollution and they're getting it in their water; it's not nice to look at. But then you do have to weigh that against the fact that people they're going to lose their jobs. What are they going to do? Most of them can't get jobs someplace else. People that work in that factory are probably not lower poverty level people just way down the bottom so they probably have some kind of skill so they can get another job. The government should probably be . . . if there are going to . . . the government imposed a regulation on this factory, the factory is not complying

with them and it's too expensive. Okay, so if the government is the cause of them shutting down and the government should be the one to take responsibility for these people and just kind of make sure that they are placed someplace else. If it's no place in another job, that's awfully idealistic I know.

I: New Group in Town

R: Probably what happens next is, the town gets together and unifies and runs these people out of town somehow or other just make it very, very difficult for them to live in the town. Makes it hard for them to go to the stores, although I guess most of these religious communities don't have any need to go to the stores, they pretty much grow and make what they need, but I imagine that the town will continue to harass these people until maybe eventually they'll get out of town.

I: Is that a right sort of solution?

R: No, I think because we do have freedom of religion in this country, and even though it doesn't, people don't agree with the ways these people are worshipping. You're going to have to give them the freedom to worship in the way that they want to. As long as they respect your rights as well as you respecting them.

I: Could there be any other possible solutions to that, any other than the one that you first thought of? Could there be any way to negotiate a settlement between these people? Would that be very likely?

R: Oh, I think so. I didn't think about that. Yeah I would think so. I'd guess it would really depend on where it happened. If it was here in the South, in South Georgia, I don't think there would be a chance of a settlement. If it was, oh, I don't know, in some other place, I'm sure that the people could sit down and make some kind of settlement. But people, I think that right now you know these religious cults, it's hard to make a settlement because people are so down on these religious cults right now because of the Jonestown thing and Moonies and all this other stuff. So that would make it really difficult, it would take a lot.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adorno, T. W., et al. (1969). The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Norton. Originally published in 1950.

Babbie, Earl (1979). The Practice of Social Research, Second Edition. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing.

Barton, Allen and R. Wayne Parsons (1977). "Measuring Belief System Structure." Public Opinion Quarterly 41:159-181.

Basseches, Michael (1978). "Dialectical Schemata in Mature Cognition." Presented at the annual meeting of the International Society of Political Psychology, New York.

Bennett, W. Lance (1980a). "The Paradox of Public Discourse: A Framework of the Analysis of Political Accounts." Journal of Politics 42:792-819.

Bennett, W. Lance (1980b). Public Opinion in American Politics. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Bennett, W. Lance (1981). "Perception and Cognition: An Information-Processing Framework for Politics." In Samuel Long (ed.), The Handbook of Political Behavior, Volume 1. New York: Plenum Press.

Bertowitz, Leonard and Kenneth Lutterman (1968-69). "The Traditionally Socially Responsible Personality." Public Opinion Quarterly 32:169-185.

Binford, Michael (1981). "Democratic Belief Systems and Styles of Reasoning: The Semi-Projective Method." Presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Botsch, Robert (1980). We Shall Not Overcome: Populism and Southern Blue-Collar Workers. Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press.

Brown, Steven (1974). "Intensive Analysis in Political Research." Political Methodology 1:1-25.

Brown, S. R. (1980). Political Subjectivity: Applications of Q Methodology in Political Science. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Burwen, Leroy, D. Campbell and J. Kidd (1956). "Use of a Sentence Completion Test in Measuring Attitudes Toward Superiors and Subordinates." Journal of Applied Psychology 40:248-250.

Converse, Philip (1964). "The Nature of Belief Systems in Mass Publics." In David Apter (ed.), Ideology and Discontent. New York: Free Press.

Dawson, Paul (1979). "The Formation and Structure of Political Belief Systems." Political Behavior 1:99-122.

Denzin, Norman (1970). The Research Act: A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods. Chicago: Aldine.

Diesing, Paul (1971). Patterns of Discovery in the Social Sciences. Chicago: Aldine.

Fenno, Richard (1978). Home Style: House Members in Their Districts. Boston: Little Brown.

Fishkin, James, Kenneth Keniston and Catharine MacKinnon (1973). "Moral Reasoning and Political Ideology." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 27:109-119.

Gibson, James and Richard Bingham (1979). "Conditions of Commitment to Civil Liberties: Libertarian Behavior of American Elites." Presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington.

Fontana, A. F. and B. Noel (1973). "Moral Reasoning in the University." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 27:419-429.

Glaser, Barney and Anselm Strauss (1967). The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research. New York: Aldine.

Greenstein, Fred and Sidney Tarrow (1970). "Political Orientations of Children: The Use of a Semi-Projective Technique in Three Nations." Sage Professional Papers in Comparative Politics 01-009 1:479-558.

Gutmann, David, Stanley Rothman, and S. Robert Lichter (1979). "Two Kinds of Radicals: A Discriminant Analysis of a Projective Test." Journal of Personality Assessment 43:12-22.

Herbst, P. G. (1970). Behavioral Worlds: The Study of Single Cases. London: Tavistock.

Holsti, Ole (1969). Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Howes, Richard (1981). "The Rorschach: Does It Have a Future." Journal of Personality Assessment 45:339-351.

Knutson, Jeanne (1972). The Human Basis of the Polity. Chicago: Aldine.

Knutson, Jeanne (1973a). "New Frontiers in Projective Techniques." In Jeanne Knutson (ed.), The Handbook of Political Psychology. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Knutson, Jeanne (1973b). "Personality in the Study of Politics." In Jeanne Knutson (ed.), The Handbook of Political Psychology. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Knutson, Jeanne (1974a). "Constraints on Political Learning: Pre-Political Ideology in Black and White Children." Berkeley: The Wright Institute.

Knutson, Jeanne (1974b). "Individual Differences in Pre-Political Ideology: The Basis of Political Learning." In R. Niemi (ed.), New Views of Children and Politics. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lane, Robert (1962). Political Ideology: Why the Common Man Believes What He Does. New York: Free Press.

Lane, Robert (1969). Political Thinking and Consciousness: The Private Life of the Political Man. Chicago: Markham.

Lane, Robert (1973). "Patterns of Political Beliefs." In Jeanne Knutson (ed.), The Handbook of Political Psychology. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lasswell, Harold (1948). "The General Framework: Person, Personality, Group, Culture." In Harold Lasswell (ed.), The Analysis of Political Behavior. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.

Loevinger, Jane and Ruth Wessler (1970). Measuring Ego Development Volume 1: Construction and Use of a Sentence Completion Test. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Merelman, Richard (1971). "The Development of Policy Thinking in Adolescence." American Political Science Association 65:1033-1047.

Merelman, Richard (1973). "The Structure of Policy Thinking in Adolescence." American Political Science Association 67:161-166.

Merelman, Richard (1977). "Moral Development and Potential Radicalism in Adolescence." Youth and Society 9:29-54.

Merelman, Richard and Ann McCabe (1974). "Evolving Orientations Toward Policy Choice in Adolescence." American Journal of Political Science 18:665-680.

Murstein, Bernard (ed.) (1965). Handbook of Projective Techniques. New York: Basic Books.

O'Connor, R. E. (1974). "Political Activism and Moral Reasoning: Political and Apolitical Students in Great Britain and France." British Journal of Political Science 4:53-79.

Patterson, John (1979). "Moral Development and Political Thinking: The Case of Freedom of Speech." Western Political Quarterly 32:7-20.

Rabin, A. (ed.) (1968). Projective Techniques in Personality Assessment. New York: Springer Publishing.

Rood, Steven (1979). "A Reappraisal of Theories of Voting." Presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C.

Rosengren, Karl (ed.) (1981). Advances in Content Analysis. Sage Annual Reviews of Communication Research, Volume 9. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Sabato, Larry (1981). The Rise of Political Consultants. New York: Basic Books.

Sarat, Austin (1975). "Reasoning in Politics: The Social, Political and Psychological Bases of Principled Thought." American Journal of Political Science 19:247-261.

Schneidman, E. (1965). "Projective Techniques." In Benjamin Wolman (ed.), Handbook of Clinical Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Schwartz, Howard and Jerry Jacobs (1979). Qualitative Sociology: A Method to the Madness. New York: Free Press.

Searing, Donald, Joel Schwartz and Alden Lind (1973). "The Structuring Principle: Political Socialization and Belief Systems." American Political Science Review 67:415-432.

Searing, Donald, Gerald Wright and George Rabinowitz (1976). "The Primacy Principle: Attitude Change and Political Socialization." British Journal of Political Science 6:88-113.

Simpson, Elizabeth (1971). Democracy's Stepchildren: A Study in Need and Belief. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Smith, M. Brewster, Jerome Bruner and Robert White (1956). Opinions and Personality. New York: Wiley.

Sylvia, Ronald, Husain Mustafa and Howard Hamilton (1981). "Political Value Judgments of Children: An Application of Moral Development Theory." Polity 13:383-409.